



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/345,289	06/30/1999	SRIDHAR SRINIVASA IYENGAR	04MV1073	1050

34225 7590 12/31/2002

UNISYS CORP.  
25725 JERONIMO ROAD, MS400  
MISSION VIEJO, CA 92691

EXAMINER

ANYA, CHARLES E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2126

DATE MAILED: 12/31/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 09/345,289	Applicant(s) IYENGAR, SRIDHAR SRINIVASA	
	Examiner Charles E Anya	Art Unit 2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 November 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- |                                                                                              |                                                                             |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____  |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)         | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 – 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (XML Metadata Interchange (XMI) (hereinafter referred to as XMI pages 1 – 170) in view of Framingham Corporate Center (hereinafter referred to as Framingham pages 1 – 26).

As to claim 1, XMI teaches a Software Tool (UML page 5-32 line 13 – 20), a Repository (MOF page 5-32 line 13 – 20), Distributed Hetrogeneous Environment (Heterogeneous Environment page 5-31 line 4 – 12), storing metadata describing meta-models (“meta-models...” page 5-32 line 13 – 15: NOTE: Registering is inherent in the storing of objects because the objects have to be registered and then stored in the repository), generating a set of rules corresponding to the metadata (“XMI generation rules...” page 5-32 line 21 – 26), generating a stream of data representing a document (XML document page 6-35 line 9 – 15).

XMI is silent with reference to an exporter module and an importer module.

Framingham teaches an Exporter Module and an Importer Module (“export/import...” page 20 line 10 – 22). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Framingham

to the system of XML. One would have been motivated to make such modifications to provide round trip model exchange without information loss (page 11 line 33 – 34).

As to claim 2, see the rejection of claim 1.

As to claim 3, see the rejection of claim 1.

As to claim 4, XML teaches XML Document Type Definitions (XML DTD page 5-32 line 21 – 26).

As to claim 5, XML teaches XML Metadata Interchange (XML page 5-32 line 21 – 32).

As to claim 6, see the rejection of claim 1.

As to claim 7, see the rejection of claim 2.

As to claim 8, see the rejection of claim 3.

As to claim 9, see the rejection of claim 4.

As to claim 10, see the rejection of claim 5.

As to claim 11, claims 1 – 5 meets claim 11.

As to claim 12, see the rejection of claim 1.

As to claim 13, claim 1 meets claim 13 except for a second repository.

XML teaches a Second Repository because the UML tool inherently includes a repository.

As to claim 14, see the rejection of claim 3.

As to claim 15, claim 1 meets claim 15 because the transmitting and storing steps of claim 1 must be transformed before transmitting and storing between the MOF and UML repositories.

As to claim 16, see the rejection of claim 13 and also note that a second exporter module and a second importer module are inherent because each of the repositories (MOF and UML) includes an exporter module and an importer module.

As to claim 17, see the rejection of claims 16 and 15.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 - 17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant's inclusion of claims 12 – 17 necessitated this final rejection.

### ***Conclusion***

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2126


the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles E Anya whose telephone number is (703) 305-3411. The examiner can normally be reached on M – F (First Friday Off) from 8:30 am to 5:30 pm.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

Charles E Anya  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2126



ALVIN OBERLEY  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100